

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated March 24, 2005, the Examiner objected to claims 6 and 20 due to informalities. The Examiner also objected to claim 15 as failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 8. The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lipp (U.S. Patent No. 5,398,022). The Examiner objected to claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10, and 12-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner allowed claims 19 and 20. The rejections and objections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to claims 6 and 20 due to informalities. In response, claims 6 and 20 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 6 and 20 on the bases of informalities.

The Examiner objected to claim 15 as failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 8, in particular noting that the limitation "the display screen" has already been recited in claim 8. The applicants respectfully disagree. The recitation of a display screen in claim 8 provides the environment in which the apparatus of claim 8 operates. That is, the apparatus of claim 8 comprises a light source and a processor, wherein the light source and processor operate to provide a controlled illumination of a display screen in portable wireless communication device. The applicants believe that the display screen is not claimed as part of the apparatus of claim 8 and that claim 15, in claiming the display screen as part of the apparatus, further limits the subject matter of claim 8. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 15.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lipp. With respect to claim 1, the Examiner contended that Lipp teaches a method for controlling an illumination of a display screen (50) in portable wireless communication device (5) including illuminating the display screen (50) (via a light

source (60), FIG. 1), determining at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on a type of message to be displayed (col. 3, lines 14-17), and maintaining the illumination of the display screen for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter (col. 3, lines 41-53). The applicants respectfully disagree.

In the sections cited by the Examiner, Lipp merely teaches a user-controlled illumination of a display of a pager based on an actuation of a switch by the user. That is, the pager receives, decodes, and stores a message. When the user depresses a key (thereby actuating the switch) for less than a predetermined period of time, preferably 1.5 seconds, the pager retrieves the stored message and displays the message on a display (50). When the user depresses the key for more than the predetermined period of time, the pager further illuminates the screen. The illumination time parameter, that is, the 1.5 seconds, merely corresponds to the depression of the key by the user. Nowhere does Lipp teach the features of claim 1 of a determining of an illumination time parameter corresponding to any of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, or a type of message to be displayed.

Therefore, Lipp does not teach the features of claim 1 of method for controlling an illumination of a display screen in portable wireless communication device including determining at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed, and maintaining the illumination of the display screen for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-3 and 5-7 depend upon allowable claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-3 and 5-7 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 8 teaches a processor that determines at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed, and maintains a coupling of power to the light source for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter. As noted above, such a processor is not taught by Lipp. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 8 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 9-10 and 12-15 depend upon allowable claim 8, the applicants respectfully request that claims 9-10 and 12-15 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Tal Mor, et al.

By: 

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750